

Therefore, no new matter has been added by the present Amendment. Upon entry of the Amendment, claims 13-16 are pending.

In the Final Office Action dated December 19, 2002, the Examiner rejected claims 13 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Kobayashi (U.S. Patent No. 5,351,872), and rejected claims 15 and 16 as being unpatentable over Kobayashi, in view of Satoh (U.S. Patent No. 6,338,980), or Ohuchi (U.S. Patent No. 6,107,164), or Riding et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,083,811).

Further, in the Advisory Action dated May 27, 2003, in response to Applicants' Request for Reconsideration filed March 19, 2003, the Examiner stated on the Continuation sheet of the Advisory Action that "keeping the pins at a peak position for an amount of time that allows the chips to be peeled from the tape . . . is an inherent property." Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's allegation of such inherency. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner provide a reference or an affidavit in support of the allegation. See M.P.E.P. §21434.03, 8th ed., 2001.

Applicants submit that, as discussed in the Request for Reconsideration filed March 19, 2003, Kobayashi fails to teach at least the features of "keeping the pins at a peak position for an amount of time to facilitate peeling the chip off the adhesive tape" and that "the pins do not pierce the tape", as recited in independent claim 13. Moreover, neither of Satoh, Ohuchi, and Riding et al. overcomes this deficiency of Kobayashi.

FINNEGAN
HENDERSON
FARABOW
GARRETT &
DUNNER LLP

1300 I Street, NW
Washington, DC 20005
202.408.4000
Fax 202.408.4400
www.finnegan.com

Furthermore, Applicants submit that Kobayashi also fails to teach at least "blowing inert gas at a high temperature to the adhesive tape so as to decrease adhesion of the adhesive tape," as recited in new independent claim 13. Neither of Satoh, Ohuchi, and Riding et al. teaches or suggests that feature of claim 13.

In view of the above, claim 13 is patentable over Kobayashi. Claims 14-16 are patentable over Kobayashi in view of Satoh, Ohuchi, and Riding et al., because Kobayashi, taken alone or in combination with Satoh, Ohuchi, and Riding et al., fails to teach or suggest each and every element of claim 13, from which claim 14-16 depend.


Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration of the application and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

If there is any fee due in connection with the filing of this Amendment, please charge the fee to our Deposit Account No. 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: June 19, 2003

By:  Reg. No. 31,744
for

FINNEGAN
HENDERSON
FARABOW
GARRETT &
DUNNER LLP

1300 I Street, NW
Washington, DC 20005
202.408.4000
Fax 202.408.4400
www.finnegan.com

APPENDIX TO AMENDMENT FILED JUNE 19, 2003

Amended claim:

13. (Twice Amended) A method of manufacturing a semiconductor device, comprising:

adhering on an adhesive side of an adhesive tape chips separated by dicing a wafer; and

repeating a step of peeling a chip off the adhesive tape to sequentially peel the chips off the adhesive tape, wherein the step of peeling a chip off the adhesive tape comprises:

blowing inert gas at a high temperature to the adhesive tape so as to decrease adhesion of the adhesive tape;

thrusting the chip using pins from a back side of the adhesive tape with the adhesive tape between the chip and the pins, and keeping the pins at a peak position for an amount of time to facilitate peeling the chip off the adhesive tape, wherein the pins do not pierce the adhesive tape;

descending a collet from the adhesive side of the adhesive tape to contact and suck the chip when the chip is peeled off the adhesive tape; and

picking the chip up by ascending the collet.

FINNEGAN
HENDERSON
FARABOW
GARRETT &
DUNNER LLP

1300 I Street, NW
Washington, DC 20005
202.408.4000
Fax 202.408.4400
www.finnegan.com